

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,010	06/20/2000	Antoine Bastard	P/3255-43	5043
2352	7590 06/03/2004		EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			LAZOR, MICHELLE A	
NEW YORK, NY 100368403		3	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/598,010	BASTARD ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michelle A Lazor	1734			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 5/19/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) Method they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	r reconsideration has been cons 	idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:		•			
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	•				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10.

Appround 140.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Claims 43 - 70, directed to an apparatus, have not been previously considered, and may require restriction. Additionally, no arguments were made with respect to the specific rejections outlined in the Final Office Action (5/17/04). The previous arguments presented (3/18/04) were directed to a different set of claims, and therefore are not considered applicable to the presently amended claims (4/16/04).